

EXHIBIT 2

From: Eckstein, Maya
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 6:21 PM
To: David Yerushalmi; Elliker, Kevin
Cc: 'C. Page'; Powell, Lewis; King, Jeremy
Subject: RE: Plaintiffs Document Production in Response to R Mast RFPs

Mr. Yerushalmi,

We write in response to your request that Plaintiffs identify the requests for production to which each document they produced is responsive. You accuse Plaintiffs of a “class document dump.” We reject that notion and, regardless, any difficulty you are having in navigating the documents is a situation of your own making.

First, Plaintiffs produced documents as they are maintained by the Does in the ordinary course of business. While the Does themselves are not “in business,” the documents were produced as the Does regularly maintained the documents – including in their counsel’s files. For example, many of the documents that Plaintiffs produced to you are documents that your client, Richard Mast, produced on behalf of his clients, Joshua and Stephanie Mast, in the state court litigation. Others are documents otherwise received from various non-parties to that litigation. These documents are maintained in counsel’s files and were produced to you as they are kept in the ordinary course of business. Having produced or received the same documents in the circuit court action, your client certainly is intimately familiar with their content.

Second, Plaintiffs produced these documents with metadata that includes various fields – including To, From, CC, Subject, Sent Date, Received Date, and Custodian, among others – which are viewable and searchable by you, thereby allowing you to easily navigate through them.

Third, we note that your Requests for Production asked for TIFF images with searchable text of ESI. See Defendant Richard Mast’s First Set of Requests for Production to Plaintiffs John Doe and Jane Doe, Definitions and Instructions 24 and 25. We were prepared to produce the documents to you in that format, but instead produced PDF images at your subsequent request, made in the April 20, 2023 meet and confer held with Mr. Elliker and Mr. King. If you would like us to now re-produce searchable TIFF images of the documents, we are happy to do so. Let us know.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs have met their obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 34. Let us know if you have additional questions.

Relatedly, I note that we recently did a refresh collection from our client’s cell phones. We are now in the process of reviewing for production the newly-collected information and will produce responsive information in due course.

Finally, you have yet to respond to the attached email that Mr. Elliker sent to you on July 7, 2023. Please provide a response by the end of this week.

Thank you.

Maya



Maya Eckstein

Partner

meckstein@HuntonAK.com

p 804.788.8788

[bio](#) | [vCard](#)

Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP
Riverfront Plaza, East Tower
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219

2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037
HuntonAK.com